



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PLAY OF
ALBION KNIGHT

It has been generally recognized that the mid-sixteenth century play *Albion Knight*,¹ of which a fragment is extant, was political in character.² Little attempt, however, has been made to throw further light upon it, either by fixing more definitely the period to which it belongs, or by analyzing the theories of the commonwealth which it upholds or satirizes. Collier³ suggested that it might be identical with a play acted at Court in 1559, which gave such offence to the Queen that the players were commanded to leave off, but a careful study of the allusions in the fragment makes this suggestion very doubtful. Nevertheless the play seems to have a close connection with political affairs in England between 1559 and 1566; and it is the purpose of this article to bring together certain historical facts in order to indicate how they correspond to lines and incidents in the play.

According to Collier, the play was intended as a lesson in statecraft to Queen Elizabeth at the beginning of her reign, a lesson which she regarded with displeasure. Had such been the author's intention, it is likely that the main character would have been Principality, as it frequently was in political moralities from Lindsay down; but instead the central figure is Albion, a personification of England. If the references made to Principality were meant to be censorious, at least they were very discreetly worded. The argument in this connection is that Principality is in danger of causing harm to the country owing to the machinations of Division and Injury, who attempt to sow strife between him and Commonalty. It is difficult to see why the Queen at the beginning of her reign should have found this warning objectionable. Moreover, supposing that this were the case, it is hardly likely that Colwell would have printed *Albion Knight* in the year 1565-6,⁴ when

¹ Collier describes it in his *History of Dramatic Poetry*, Vol. II, p. 369, and prints it in the Shakespeare Society's *Papers* I, pp. 55 ff. Also printed by the Malone Society, ed. W. W. Greg. *Collections* I, iii, pp. 231-242.

² Tucker Brooke, *The Tudor Drama*, p. 109.

Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit., V, p. 139.

Collier & Greg, v. *supra*.

³ Collier, Shakespeare Society's *Papers* I, p. 55.

⁴ Arber's *Transcript* I, p. 299.

the reign was yet new and the various parties in the State were striving for power.

It appears from some of the speeches that comparative peace and plenty prevailed in England, and a desire to continue in such a state.⁵ But when Elizabeth ascended the throne, persecution at home and losses abroad were far from making England a land of security. Not until some years later could anyone have complained, as Injury does,⁶ of the lack of "any enterpryse" in the country. By 1566, however, it seems that the country was enjoying prosperity. In his closing address to the Second Parliament, in 1566, the Speaker expressed gratitude for the benefits which England was enjoying—"Yet this our Native Country he hath blessed, not only with the like, but also with much more fruitfulness than any other; of which great and inestimable benefit of Gods preferment which appeareth better by the want that others have of the same, I am occasioned now to speak, the rather to move and stir up our hearts to give most hearty thanks to God for the same."⁷ This agrees notably with some of Injury's complaints in the play.

In spite of this underlying care for preserving Peace and Plenty, the more obvious allusions in *Albion Knight* are political rather than social. The emphasis is laid on the method of making and executing laws; the author's satire is directed against both the Parliament and the Administration.

We are told that Justice is not upheld. However good an Act may be for the common weal, if it brings loss to Principality, the Lords, Temporal or Spiritual, or the Merchants, it will not be put into force. Injury's business is to see that this injustice is kept up. Ll. 133 ff.

When I agaynst ryght make styffe defence
That Justyce in his seate may not be enstabled
.
Yet mayntenaunce and I wyll kepe the chere.

Double Device, too, intends to raise the suspicions of the Commons against Principality by suggesting, Ll. 290 ff.—

That his lawes indifferently
Be not used, but maintenaunce and brybary
Is suffred alone without reformation.

⁵ Eg:Ll. 345-357.

⁶ Ll. 51-54.

⁷ Simonds D'Ewes, *Journals of all the Parliaments during the reign of Queen Elizabeth*, Ed. 1682, p. 114.

It cannot, of course, be said that defects in legal justice were peculiar to any period. Nevertheless, this was a special grievance during the first years of Elizabeth's reign. Thus Camden mentions the difficulty of putting into operation the early statutes concerning religion, because the justices themselves were Catholics.⁸ The Council of 1565, he tells us, desired to grant "unto the Bishops more ample authority to exercise the Ecclesiastical Laws, against that Scare-crow of the Praemunire which the Lawyers cast in their way . . . and by compelling the Judges of the Land (which were almost all of them Papists) to acknowledge the Queen's Supremacy by Oath."⁹ Inasmuch as many Merchant Laws were passed during these years, it is reasonable to suppose that attempts would be made to evade their restrictions, especially at first.¹⁰ There was a growing feeling against the officers of the Queen's Household and the Government, which crystallised in laws limiting their power. Whether their former power was contrary to law or not is not easy to say. Some of the Bills passed in the Parliament of 1566 throw an interesting light on the administration of justice. One notes for example:—

A Bill for the execution of certain statutes, and for the reformation of certain disorders used in the law.

A Bill for execution of Penal Laws.

A Bill to avoid delays upon verdicts and demurrers in law.

A Bill to avoid long delays in civil and marine causes.¹¹

Still more striking are passages from the Lord Keeper's speeches at the end of Parliamentary Sessions.

At the close of the First Parliament in 1559—

"For the second [i.e. Administration of Justice] you are to provide, that all Embracers, Maintainers and Champerties, which be utter Enemies to the due Execution of Justice between Subject and Subject, be neither committed by any of you, nor (as near as you can) be suffered to be committed by any other. . . . Is it not (trow you) a monstrous disguising to have a Justicer a maintainer, to have him that should by his Oath and Duty set forth Justice and right against his Oath and Duty to offer injury and wrong; . . . by *leading* and *swaying* of Juries according to his Will, acquitting

⁸ Camden, *History of the Princess Elizabeth*, Ed. 1688, p. 76.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 76-77.

¹⁰ E.g. see D'Ewes, pp. 68-73, in the Parliament of 1562-3.

¹¹ D'Ewes, pp. 99, 110, 128, 129 respectively.

some for Gain, enditing others for Malice. . . ."¹² This injunction speaks definitely of the evil itself, and of the means by which it flourished. As in the play, maintenance and bribery were the prominent means of corruption. The references to this injustice were vaguer at the close of the sessions of the Second Parliament, in 1563¹³ and 1566.¹⁴ The tone of the Lord Keeper's addresses, however, and the laws which it was found necessary to enact, prove sufficiently that the evil had not ceased to exist.

In the play Injury tells Albion that this difference between the law as made and as executed brought "universall derysion" upon him, so that he was regarded as "half a man and half a wild goose." The saying of the Guises in 1563 is not quite parallel—"Neither was there any confiding in the Authority of a Parliament; for in England, what one Parliament established, another repealed,"¹⁵ since this refers to the making rather than to the carrying out of laws. It is well-known, however, that at that time English sentiment was particularly sensitive to opinion. The loss of Calais was still felt keenly. When peace was made with France in 1559, we are told that it "was ill taken by the people, as dishonourable to the English for the Loss of Calice, and not restoring thereof."¹⁶ It is not taking too great liberties, perhaps, to give a general significance to Injury's words here, rather than to insist on their context and refer them only to the matter of the execution of the law.

The references to legislation which one finds in the play afford no evidence that the author wrote against the power of Parliament as such. Injury describes the members as "babbling," and seems to satirise their debates in lines 233 ff. when he says that he will so act,

That the poore comons is in altercation
Of this matter and wote not what to say.

What the author is concerned about is not so much the wisdom of Parliament as the importance of concord between it and Princi-

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 34.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 116. Cf. also p. 152, where the Address at the close of the Parliament of 1571 shows that the difficulty continued.

¹⁵ Camden, *op cit.*, p. 68.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

pality. This is in danger for Division plans to send his spy "Double Device" to say to Principality:—Ll. 275 ff.

That the commons' hartes do aryse
Against him, when that he doth aske
In tyme of neede, our money for taske,

and to inform the Commons that Principality rebels against equity, and thinks more of himself than of the Common-weale. He is careless of their defence by sea and land, so that "thieves and murders" are permitted. Laws are overcome by bribery and maintenance. As a result, the Commons will not know whether to grant the money or not. In addition, Division must warn Albion that Principality:—Ll. 366 ff.

in no wyse
His will with equitye will graunt to exercyse
But that the law shuld be but after his lyking
And euery wryt after his entytelyng
And that his will who ever lyst to stryfe
Shuld be the best part for hys prerogatyfe.

It has been shown already that "bribery and maintenance" were popular grievances of the period. The other causes of dissension, supply, defence and royal prerogative, were first felt in 1563, and became critical in the second session of that Parliament, 1565-6. Need was felt of strengthening the Navy and Garrisons in 1558, but there seems to have been absolute agreement upon it. At the beginning of the Session the Lord Keeper addressed the Houses on the Queen's graciousness in consulting with them on any matter of weight before making any Resolutions.¹⁷ At the end of the Session, they were praised for the grave consideration which they had given to the disputable matters.¹⁸

But if there was no tension in the First Parliament, the Second was by no means quiescent. The Crown's power to grant Patents was challenged by the passing of various Bills to confirm the patents which the Queen had granted.¹⁹ In his address at the close of Parliament, the Speaker referred to this—"Although there be for the Prince provided [in our Common Law] many Princely Prerogatives and Royalties, yet it is not such, as the Prince can take money, or other things, or do as he will at his own pleasure without order; but quietly to suffer his Subjects to enjoy their own

¹⁷ D'Ewes, *op cit.*, pp. 11-12.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 125, 128, 131.

without wrongful oppression, wherein other Princes by their Liberty do take as pleaseth them."²⁰ The Queen's reply through the Lord Keeper was sharp, and a little more definitely parallels the play- "Politick Orders be Rules of all good Acts, and touching those that you have made to the over-throwing of good Laws, they deserve reproof as well as the others deserve praise; in which like case you err, in bringing her Majesties Prerogative in question, and for that thing, wherein she meant not to hurt any of your Liberties. And again, the grant of her Letters Patents in question is not a little marvail, for that therein you find fault; which is now no new devised thing, but such as afore this time hath been used and put in practice."²¹

The question of Supply came up more frequently, though not more specifically, than that of Prerogative. During the session of 1562-3, members began to be restive concerning the matter of the Queen's Marriage and the Succession to the throne. A petition was sent to the Queen. Her vaguely-worded answer was temporarily satisfactory. During the second session the subject was revived. It was decided then that the motion concerning the Succession and the vote of Subsidy should "proceed together." Both seem to have caused much discussion. On the 18th of October "A Motion was made by Mr. Molineux, for the reviving of the Suit touching the Declaration of a Successor, in case her Majesty should die without Issue of her own Body: and that the said business touching the Declaration of the Successor, and the Subsidy Bill might proceed together, which Motion was very well approved by the greater part of the said House. . . ." ²² Cecil and Knolles tried to divert the discussion, but without avail, and it seems that the motion of the Succession and the Subsidy with an ominous extra third of the Rate went through the House at the same time. The question of "liberties and privileges of the House" was mentioned when the Queen sent her commands to the House to proceed no further in its suit. The storm calmed when, some days later, she remitted the extra third that had been voted. D'Ewes's note on this incident, however, is instructive—"That here her Majesty (as is very probable) did remit this third and extraordinary payment of the Subsidy the more yet to withdraw them from the further

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 115-116.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 124 ff.

prosecution of that great business touching the Declaration of a Successor, (mentioned at large on Monday, the 25th day of this instant November foregoing) in which those of the House of Commons had proceeded with great violence: and that her Majesty had this intent in remitting the said third payment, is the more apparent, because it had been formerly given by the said Commons, thereby the rather to induce her Majesty to the said Declaration of a Successor."²³ In the Speaker's address to the Crown at the close of Parliament, the grant of Subsidy is again linked with services from her Majesty. The Speaker regrets that the Queen would not accept the extra "third," and proceeds to explain that the Subsidy is granted in the way of Policy for their defence, and of duty, as an honest return for the benefits conferred by her Majesty. He ends with "thanks to God, for that your Highness hath signified your pleasure of your inclination to Marriage . . . *which is done for our safeguard.*"²⁴ [Italics are mine.]

It is necessary to notice here that the Delay of the Subsidy was, in fact, associated with the matter of the Succession, whereas in the play it was associated with the removal of grievances. Not until 1571 was it definitely proposed that no Supply should be voted until the Queen should remove stated wrongs from which the country was suffering. But this is after all not a real discrepancy.

In the first place, the Succession movement was always inspired by a fear of the dangers which would follow were the Queen to die without an heir. Thus D'Ewes quotes from the Commons' petition of 1562—"They cannot, I say, but acknowledge your Majesty hath most graciously considered the great dangers, the unspeakable miseries of Civil Wars, the perillous and intermingling of Foreign Princes with seditious, ambitious, and factious Subjects at home, the waste of noble Houses, the slaughter of People, subversions of Towns, intermission of all things pertaining to the maintenance of the Realm, unsurety of all mens Possessions, Lives and Estates, daily interchange of Attainders and Treasons. All these mischiefs, and infinite other, most likely and evident, if your Majesty should be taken from us, without known Heir."²⁵ The safety of the realm and Succession were linked together; both matters were connected with the opinion of the Commons that—

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 131. Also Camden, *op cit.*, pp. 85-6.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 81 ff.

they ought not to pay
To pryncypalitie theyre duety of very desarte
Except lyke duetie be mynistréd on hys parte.

Secondly, it is very likely that the Subsidies may have been more closely scrutinised than we are aware of, and that improvements in government were expected.

Particular mention is made in the play of the lack of defence by sea and by land. This was a matter of moment during Elizabeth's reign. In the first Parliament, the Ministers pointed to the necessity of being careful in executing Justice against rioters and all who create uproar, of making laws against those private men who practised things contrary to the Commonwealth of the realm.²⁶ Each of the early Parliaments legislated against vagabonds. In these ways, an attempt was made to give quiet and security on land. The safety of the sea was a matter of equal concern. There are references to the need for it before Elizabeth's time. John Bale in his *Vocacyon* relates that a ship of Lynne and a ship of Totnes were captured by a Flemish boat in one day.²⁷ That was during the early part of Mary's reign. Her successor aimed at maintaining a powerful navy and garrisons on the seacoasts. The Address of 1558²⁸ enumerates rather fully the particular defences that were needed. Yet there was no immediate protection on the seas. In 1561, Camden²⁹ tells us that English Merchants' ships were taken on the coast of Britain. In 1563³⁰ "the Spaniard's conceived anger he openly discovered —by laying hands on certain English Merchants Ships in the Havens of Boetica (now called Andalusia) for that the English in pursuing the French, had taken certain Ships of the Spaniards." In the Parliament of 1563, there seems to have been some debate concerning the Bill for increasing the Navy,³¹ though no record of criticism is preserved. At the end of the session we are told—"The Estates, congratulating the Happiness of the Times, granted unto the Queen, for Religion reformed, Peace restored, England with Scotland freed from the Foreign Enemy, Money refined,

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 12, 33.

²⁷ *Harleian Miscellany* I, p. 355.

²⁸ D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

²⁹ Camden, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 69.

³¹ D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, pp. 86, 87. (March 2nd, 9th and 11th.)

the Navy renewed, warlike Munition by sea and land provided, and for the laudable Enterprize in France for the securing of England and of the young king of France, and the recovering of Calice, (they granted, I say) the Ecclesiastical men one Subsidy, and the Laity another, with two Fifteens and Tenths."³² Thus in 1563 we find money granted as the price of specified things done for the country. It would be but a step from this to a refusal to grant a subsidy because certain things had not been done. Moreover, in 1566 the Ministers were careful to remind the House of the Queen's "late great and extraordinary expences, to proportion out some supply accordingly."³³

This care to show that the Supplies were used for ensuring the safety of the country makes us remember that ordinary people would be more concerned with peace and prosperity than with the question of an heir to the throne. Though there is no record to show that the subsidy was used as a weapon to secure effective defences, it is clear that it could be so used. To some extent such pressure was used in the case of the Succession. That it could be made heavier is shown by the letters of Guzman de Silva, the Spanish Ambassador. He is writing of the bill for legalising the new Bishops' Orders, which had passed the Commons, but discussion of which had been prohibited in the Lords. "She [Elizabeth] would be glad if anyone would stand up in Parliament, and oppose these religious innovations, as she feared that if they were passed, such pressure would be brought to bear upon her that she could not refuse her assent. This is so, for although they have voted the supplies, they have not yet presented them to the Queen, with the intention of making her first consent to what they want, and although the Commons have passed the Subsidy, the House of Lords has not done so. It is true she has no reason to doubt them (the Lords), and they are delaying for the purpose that I have mentioned." Later he wrote of the Queen's forbidding the debate in the Lords, and finally the postponement of the closing of Parliament—"The cause of the delay was that the members of the Commons being offended at the Queen's forbidding the discussion in the Upper House of the proposals which they had adopted respecting religious innovations, they refused to agree

³² Camden, *op. cit.*, p. 63 f.

³³ D'Ewes, *op. cit.* p. 124. Cf. also the Speaker's Address at the close of this Parliament, p. 273 *supra*, D'Ewes, p. 115.

to the continuation of certain laws necessary for the good government of the kingdom, which it appears are not perpetual, but have to be renewed from Parliament to Parliament."³⁴

Perhaps one must not take too seriously the suggestion in the play that Principality worked for his own ends. On the other hand, as early as 1562, Purveyors' Commissions were considered a grievance, and were revoked, both for the Garrison of Berwick and for the Royal Household.³⁵ A large proportion of the supplies, it may be noted, was assigned to the expenses of the Queen's Household.³⁶

The fragment of the play is too incomplete to tell us whether the devices of Division, Injury and the spy were successful against Principality and Commonalty. Historically the strife was unmistakable, as appears from passages already quoted from the Lord Keeper's Addresses. The Queen's own Address in 1566 is still sharper, though more general in tone—"I have in this Assembly found so much dissimulation, where I always professed plainness, that I marvel thereat, yea two Faces under one Hood, and the Body rotten, being covered with two Vizors, Succession and Liberty, which they determined must be either presently granted, denied or deferred. In granting whereof, they had their desires, and denying or deferring thereof (those things being so plaudable, as indeed to all men they are) they thought to work me that mischief, which never Foreign Enemy could bring to pass, which is the hatred of my Commons. But alas they began to pierce the Vessel before the Wine was fined, and began a thing not foreseeing the end, how by this means I have seen my well-willers from mine Enemies and can as me seemeth, very well divide the House into four. . . ."³⁷ The general sentiment of *Albion Knight* is almost identical with that of this address.

Division plans to aggravate the strife in the country by sending Old Debate to cause a wrangle between the Lords Temporal and the Lords Spiritual. The Lords Temporal were to be informed—

³⁴ *Calendar of Spanish Papers*, 1558-67, pp. 604-7.

³⁵ Camden, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

Purveyance had become a heavy grievance by 1571. V. D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, pp. 158-9.

³⁶ D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 116-117. Cf. Camden, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

That the spyrytuall men wolde rule all
 And say it were shame to them by the rood
 That ben descended from the noble blood
 To suffre any other of such powre to bee
 To haue the gouernaunce about principalytie
 Sythen they inheritoures are borne to bee
 Of the hye counsell by blood and dygnytie.

The Lords Spiritual should be told—

that god of his hye great grace
 To them hath geuen good fortune and space
 By lerning sadnes and grauitie

 That they ought by reason to rule thys land
 Because the power of temporalitie
 Hath no knowledge in conning perdie. . . .

Division hopes that

This gere will worke after my fantasye
 To make of an old grudge a new frenesie.

It is to be noted that allusion is not made here to religious controversy except perhaps in the words "old grudge," but to a dispute for predominance. But little evidence of such bickering is to be gained from the records of the time. D'Ewes relates that in the Parliament of 1558-9, the Spiritual Lords showed great obstinacy in voting continually against Protestant Bills, even when they had no hope of seeing them collapse.³⁸ The Queen's frustration of the attempt to pass certain religious Bills in 1556 has already been noted. Da Silva regarded the outcome as a victory by the Queen with the help of her temporal peers over a Protestant House of Commons and a Protestant episcopate.³⁹ Either of these incidents might have appeared to a politician-dramatist as a wrangle between the Spiritual and the Temporal Estates, but their relation to the lines quoted is too vague to be satisfactory commentary. Perhaps a key to some of the lines is to be found in the doings of the Parliament of 1562. The Com-

³⁸ D'Ewes, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-19:—Bill for the Restitution and Annexation of First Fruits and Tithes, and a Bill adding Provisoos to it; p. 28:—The Bill for the Supremacy of the Crown over the Church, and the Uniformity of Common Prayer and Church Services.

³⁹ V. p. 275 f. *supra*; *Cal. Span. Papers*, 1558-67, pp. 604-6; *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, 1547-80, p. 284. D'Ewes (pp. 132-3) makes no mention of this struggle.

mons seem to have refused to pass a Bill prepared by Convocation.⁴⁰ In addition, there was opposition to the Bill of Supremacy, which made treason the refusal of the oath for the second time. In the debate in the Lords, Lord Montague argued that the bishops ought not to have any part in making the law, because of their partisanship. Their business was to decide on doctrine and to excommunicate those who followed the false. It belonged to the secular judges to award the temporal penalties. They would act "according to the necessity of the commonwealth, for peace and quietness of the same." The speech ends with an exhortation to the Spiritual Lords, who do not "endanger their lives and goods, if any war should happen within the realm or with their neighbours," not to be led away by self-seeking men who "look to wax mighty and of power by confiscation, spoil and ruin of the houses of noble and ancient men."⁴¹ The correspondence between this and the play is not direct, but in both cases the Temporal Lords are jealous of their own power, and mindful of their nobility and ancient order.

The other side, the bishop's opinion of the functions of the peer, was given in the House of Lords during the discussion on the Bill of the Liturgy in 1559. The Bishop of Chester, after explaining that he did not desire to "speak in derogation of Parliament, which is of great strengthe in matters whereunto it extendeth," went on to say that it ought not to meddle with matters of religion. The reasons which he gave were twofold:—"Parteley for the certeintye which ought to be in our faith and religion, and the uncerteyntie of the statutes and actes of parliaments. . . . And partelye for that the parliament consisteth for the moste parte of noblemen of this realme, and certeyn of the commons, beyinge laye and temporall men: which although they be bothe of good wisdom and learninge, yet not so studied nor exercised in the scriptures, and the holie doctors and practysses of the churche, as to be competent judges in suche matters. Neyther dothe it apperteine to their vocation. . . ." ⁴² The Bishop's second reason is precisely the same as the argument which *Olde Debate* was to use in the play. The only difference is that the

⁴⁰ Strype, *Annals of the Reformation*, Ed. 1725, I, p. 355.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, I, p. 298.

⁴² *Ibid.*, I, Appendix X, p. 28. (Quoted in a different form by Selbie, *Nonconformity*, p. 27.)

Bishop limits the peers' lack of "lerning sadness and grauitie" to spiritual matters.

The above parallels between the play of *Albion Knight* and historical incidents extend over the years 1559–1566. The question of mal-administration of justice was prominent during the first year of the reign, but it remained as a matter of some concern through and beyond the period. The more important causes of friction between Queen and Parliament were not active until 1562; they grew in intensity during the following years. The references to Spirituality and Temporality are more indefinite, and the parallels quoted from speeches made in 1559 and 1563 cannot be said to be more than suggestive. The more significant analogies are connected with the Second Parliament, the years 1562–1566. One may infer that the play was written during that time, that is to say immediately before the date of its printing.

Albion Knight throws somewhat interesting light on the growth of the democratic temper, of which we have but sporadic indications in the records of these early years of Elizabeth. One wishes that one had the whole play, in order to see how Albion eventually overcomes the difficulties that beset him. But even the fragment is sufficient to indicate that the author believed strongly in Queen, Bishops, Lords, and Commons, and only desired that they might work together in unity for good government, peace and prosperity. It is far from being a "court" play, though one can imagine Sir William Cecil approving of it when Paul Wentworth, burgess, became refractory in the House of Commons.

Of the author as a dramatist, there is little to be said. He took the political morality as it had come down from Lindsay. He introduced one significant change in making Albion or England the central character, and making Principality subservient to it.⁴³ For the rest, we have the usual incidents—the advice to Albion to waste his goods in mirth and prodigality; the rollicking of the evil characters; and the use of disguise. It is interesting to note that the manner of the disguising is different from the ordinary type. Injury comes on the stage already disguised as Manhood; his meeting with Division later is closely akin to the meeting of Ill-Will and Shrewd-Wit in *Health and Wealth*. The manner of

⁴³ Bale had personified England before in *Kyng Johan*, of course. *Albion Knight* is the first example of it in a morality.

the entrance song of Division, and Injury's pretence at first of having become united with the good characters are closely similar. Both these plays have the same belief in the good of wealth and ease for the commonwealth, and the same desire for order and peace. Its Parliamentary atmosphere is the trait which distinguishes *Albion Knight* from other secular moralities.

GWEN ANN JONES.

University of Minnesota.